



ease of access to sources of proof; (3) the convenience of the parties; (4) the locus of operative facts; (5) the availability of process to compel the attendance of unwilling witnesses; (6) the relative means of the parties; (7) a forum's familiarity with the governing law; (8) the weight accorded a plaintiff's choice of forum; and (9) trial efficiency and the interests of justice, based on the totality of the circumstances.”

*Manuel v. Convergys Corp.*, 430 F.3d 1132, 1135 (11th Cir. 2005). Here, the parties represent the incident occurred in Austell, which is in the Northern District of Georgia, and that all parties are represented by counsel in the Northern District. Doc. 6-1 at 3.

Because the accident occurred in the Northern District of Georgia, counsel is located in the Atlanta, and the parties represent the Northern District of Georgia would be more convenient for them, factors (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), and (9) weigh in favor of transfer. See Doc. 6-1 at 3. Because the Plaintiff consents to the transfer, factors (6) and (8) do not weigh against it. Finally, factor (7) does not weigh in favor of or against the transfer, because, as the parties note, “both districts are equally familiar with Georgia law.” *Id.*

Those factors, therefore, weigh in favor of transfer to the Northern District of Georgia. Accordingly, transfer to the Northern District of Georgia is appropriate under 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a). The consent motion to transfer (Doc. 6) is **GRANTED**, and the Court **DIRECTS** the Clerk of Court to **TRANSFER** the case to the Northern District of Georgia.

**SO ORDERED**, this 29th day of April, 2019.

S/ Marc T. Treadwell  
MARC T. TREADWELL, JUDGE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT